IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: Dave Corboy et al.	Art Unit	: 2183
Serial No.	: 09/842,796	Examiner	: Lashonda Jacobs
Filed	: April 27, 2001	Conf. No.	: 7378
Title	: BROWSER ENVIRONMENT USING MULTIPLE BROWSER INSTANTIATIONS		

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF OCTOBER 20, 2006

Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 48-63 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 17, 22, and 23 being independent.

Independent claims 1, 17, 22 and 23, along with their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41 and 48-63, have been rejected as being anticipated by Stasnick (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,264). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 22 recites, among other features, "at the client, simultaneously executing/execute multiple instantiations of the browser application in response to the electronic data received from the host ...wherein at least one instantiation of the browser application is configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application" (emphasis added). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims, because Stasnick does not describe or suggest this feature.

As stated in the response to the Office Action of April 6, 2006, Stasnick describes a multiple-browser application 402 that allows a user to access and interact with multiple applications, including browser applications, using a single integrated user interface (col. 7, lines 18-39). Stasnick's multiple-browser application 402 may interact with a network operations center 150 or with a proxy server within a local area network 120 to manage multiple browsers and applications accessed by the user (col. 6, lines 32-37). Upon a user signing on to Stasnick's system, client configuration settings, which indicate the applications that the user is allowed or

denied access, are loaded into client configuration RAM 404 of the client 160 (col. 8, lines 49-57).

After the user signs on and the client configuration is set, the multiple-browser application 402 waits for user input before launching any applications (col. 8, lines 65-67). Only upon a user requesting that an application be launched through interactions with GUI 500 does the multiple-browser application 402 launch an application (col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 7 and col. 9, lines 13-16). Accordingly, Stasnick does not describe or suggest that multiple instantiations of a browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host, as claimed. Rather, as shown in Fig. 6, Stasnick describes applications being launched by the multiple-browser application 402 sequentially and in response to user requests, not simultaneously and in response to data received from a host.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner disagreed with the above assertions, stating:

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 7, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Office notes the following arguments:
a. Stasnick does not describe or suggests that multiple instantiations of a browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host.
In response to:
a. Stasnick discloses a multi-browser client architecture for managing multiple applications having a history list. The user in Stasnick reference accesses network resources by providing use identification to the system. The user requests network resources from the Internet in which the content is received from the server (host) to the user. Once the content is received, the user is able to navigate through the web wage [sic]. The web consists of several instantiations that communicate with each other once the user clicks on a particular feature of the web page such as (toll bar, channel buttons, etc (col. 8, lines 65-67 and col. 9, lines 1-24). Therefore, Stasnick does disclose multiple instantiations of a browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host. [Final Office Action, page 8]

Applicants are not sure whether they fully understand the Examiner's argument. First, the Examiner states that a user requests electronic content from a host across the Internet and receives the electronic content for display as a web page. Notably, such web page content is received after a browser application is already executing because the user uses the browser application to request the web page content. Thus, the web page content referred to by the Examiner as being received from a host is not a trigger for executing a browser application but rather is simply a trigger for the browser application to display to a user the web page corresponding to the web page content. Therefore, the web page content referred to by the

Examiner as being received from a host does not satisfy the feature "executing ...the browser application in response to the electronic data received from the host."

Second, the Examiner states that once the web page content is received and displayed as a web page, the user can navigate the web, presumably the World Wide Web (WWW), through the displayed web page. The Examiner then states that the Web "consists of several instantiations that communicate with each other once the user clicks on a particular feature of the web page," apparently asserting this as a justification for her assertion that Stasnick satisfies both the feature "simultaneously executing multiple instantiations of the browser application" and the feature "wherein at least one instantiation of the browser application is configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application." Applicants, however, do not understand how accessing the Web through a web page meets these features. The Web does not consist of several instantiations of a browser application that communicate with each other. Rather, the Web is simply a network of servers on the Internet that support electronic documents stored in a particular format – HTML. Accessing a web page and navigating to additional content on the Web via the web page can be accomplished through use of a single instantiation of a browser application and, contrary to the Examiner's statements as best understood, does not require executing or launching multiple instantiations of a browser application.

If applicants have misunderstood the Examiner's statements, applicants respectfully request that, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner clearly indicate: (1) what element described or suggested in Stasnick is being equated to an "instantiation of the browser application"; (2) where Stasnick describes or suggests that multiple of these elements are simultaneously executed in response to electronic data received from a host; and (3) where Stasnick describes or suggests that at least one of these multiple elements is able to exchange messages with at least one other of these multiple elements.

Absent such specificity, applicants can only reassert the reasons previously set forth in support of the contention that Stasnick fails to describe or suggest the features "at the client, simultaneously executing/execute multiple instantiations of the browser application in response to the electronic data received from the host ... wherein at least one instantiation of the browser

application is configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application" (emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41, 48-53, 56-58 and 60-62.

Independent claim 23 recites, among other features, "transmitting electronic data from the host in response to a data request received from the client, wherein the electronic data comprises instructions for simultaneously executing multiple instantiations of the browser application, at least one instantiation of the browser application being configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application" (emphasis added). For at least the reasons described above, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 and its dependent claims 54, 55, 59 and 63.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner's characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, applicants may have not addressed all characterizations of the art and reserve the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application. The absence of an explicit response by the applicants to any of the examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the examiner's positions. The fact that applicant's comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/20/06

Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40385674.doc